

Date: Mon, 4 Jan 93 04:30:25 PST
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #4
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Mon, 4 Jan 93 Volume 93 : Issue 4

Today's Topics:

Repeater Warz (was Re: 430mhz band ...)
True and correct information

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 3 Jan 1993 22:50:51 GMT
From: sdd.hp.com!col.hp.com!bobw@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Repeater Warz (was Re: 430mhz band ...)
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

pschleck@cwis.unomaha.edu (Paul W Schleck KD3FU) writes:

>
> I agree that as repeater pairs fill up, this is likely to become a very
> controversial issue. The likely solution (I know of at least one
> east-coast coordinator that is considering this) is to use automated
> monitoring tools to gather usage statistics on all coordinated repeaters
> and make low-usage (or substantially non-conflicting in the time-domain)
> pairs or triplets of repeaters share a channel, with the use of PL
> and/or directional/notched antenna arrays.

>

It will be interesting to see how this goes. I agree with the intent
of re-negotiating coordination on repeaters to get the best use of
the spectrum. But who gets to decide what 'best use' is? And what is it?
Off hand, I can't accept a simple RF-exists-on-the-frequency metric.
('course, on the other hand, I'm not sure what would be better.

rcanders@nyx.cs.du.edu (Rod Anderson) writes:

>You've got to remember the history of how 'closed' systems came to be
>popular in some areas. In many cases, hams who wanted to experiment with
>technically sophisticated remote bases, linked systems, etc, were told to
>go to 440 to play because there was hardly anyone there, and because
>closed systems weren't wanted on 2M. So they did. Now, when the lower
>bands, and 440 are all full, other hams are seeing what they see as
>underutilized spectrum, and want to re-assign it. And they're going to
>have a hard time convincing those already there that they should vacate
>the spectrum they occupied 'cause no one else wanted it in the first
>place.

Exactly. This argument applies to the 'underutilized' OPEN system
on 440 as well.

Bob Witte / HP Colo Springs / bobw@col.hp.com / KB0CY

Date: Sun, 03 Jan 93 09:04:32 PST
From: pacbell.com!pacbell!sactoh0!beagle!chandler@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: True and correct information
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

jreese@NeoSoft.com (Jim Reese) writes:

> In article <1993Jan1.155038.24275@ke4zv.uucp> gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman)
> >Sorry, this is not false information. Broadcast licensees have *always*
> >been responsible for the proper operation of their equipment. In addition,
> >the chief operator is also directly responsible for the operation of
> >the transmitting equipment, and (s)he must hold a General Radiotelephone
> >license.
>
> Not so. You must now only have a Restricted Radiotelephone Permit. The
> requirement that you have a General Radiotelephone went away several years
> ago.
>

What are the requirements for a Restricted/General Radiotelephone Permit and
what will they allow you to do. I would assume that the business class of
licensing is vaguely familiar to amateur, but maybe not.

Jim Chandler, KD6IRV
jwc@sactoh0.sac.ca.us
sactoh0!beagle!chandler

Date: Mon, 04 Jan 1993 04:21:08 GMT
From: uw-coco!nwnexus!ole!ssc!tad@beaver.cs.washington.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Jan3.005529.7508@elroy.jpl.nasa.gov>,
<uJZTwB1w164w@ham.almanac.bc.ca>, <1993Jan3.053500.18260@elroy.jpl.nasa.gov>
Subject : Re: 430mhz band under th

In article <1993Jan3.053500.18260@elroy.jpl.nasa.gov> laborde@oak.Jpl.Nasa.Gov
(Gregory R. LaBorde) writes:

>In article <uJZTwB1w164w@ham.almanac.bc.ca> emd@ham.almanac.bc.ca writes:
>>>

>>I would agree with you if I made that assumption. It's certainly possible
>>(though careless) to operate simplex unintentionally on a repeater input.
>>If you or I inadvertently operate that way, and we had it brought to our
>>attention, we'd apologize, and change frequency.

>>
>>The impression I got from the previous poster was that he felt it was his
>>right to operate anywhere in the band he felt like, and whether or not it
>>brought up a repeater - as long as he couldn't hear anyone else on the
>>channel.

>>
>
>You're right, I would apologize and attempt to change frequency, which might
>be impossible in Southern California if the single 440 MHz simplex frequency
>was in use. I feel like it *IS* the previous poster's right to operate
>simplex unintentionally on a repeater input. I feel like it is the previous
>poster's right to operate *INTENTIONALLY* on a repeater's input frequency
>PROVIDED IT IS NOT CAUSING INTERFERENCE TO ANOTHER QSO. While I may only
>be a No-Code, I can read English. All the regulations I have read and seen
^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^

Geeze.....I thought we were discussing this with someone who has long
and distinguished experience with frequency coordination and FM repeaters!

Not to diminish the talents or abilities of a new ham, but it might
be a good idea to ask some questions about the subject, rather than
making all of these dire pronouncements based upon armchair lawyering!

e

--

Tad Cook	Phone: 206-527-4089 (home)	MCI Mail: 3288544
Seattle, WA	Packet: KT7H @ N7DUO.WA.USA.NA	3288544@mcimail.com

| Internet: tad@ssc.com

or...sumax!ole!ssc!tad

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #4
